

2-6-1972

## Faculty Bulletin: February 6, 1972

La Salle University

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/faculty\\_bulletins](http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/faculty_bulletins)

---

### Recommended Citation

La Salle University, "Faculty Bulletin: February 6, 1972" (1972). *Faculty Bulletins*. 55.  
[http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/faculty\\_bulletins/55](http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/faculty_bulletins/55)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at La Salle University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Bulletins by an authorized administrator of La Salle University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [careyc@lasalle.edu](mailto:careyc@lasalle.edu).





# **LA SALLE COLLEGE**

February 6, 1972  
Vol. 10, No. 3

*Faculty Bulletin*



# CALENDAR OF EVENTS

(through April 12, 1972)

Basketball: vs. Notre Dame, Palestra, 8:05 p.m.....February 5

Guild Winter Social (Ballroom).....February 5

Feature Film: "Gimme Shelter", 7:00, 8:45 & 10:30 p.m.,  
Theatre.....February 5

Basketball: vs. Drexel, National Guard Armory.....February 7

President's Council: evening division, 9:55 p.m., CU 301.....February 8

Ring Day: orders taken in Union Lobby, 9:00 a.m.-8:30 p.m.....February 9

New Cinema: "Claire's Knee", 12:30 & 6 p.m., Theatre.....February 9

Faculty Senate Open Session, 12:30 p.m., CU 301.....February 10

President's Forum: Theatre, 12:00 p.m.....February 10

Coffee House: club room, 7:30 - 12:00 p.m.....February 11-12

Film: "Cromwell", 7:00 & 9:40 p.m., Theatre.....February 11-12

Freshman Basketball: vs. Temple Univ., Wister Gym, 7:30 p.m.....February 14

Taped Music Program: And All That Jazz, music room.....February 14

Women's Basketball: vs. Beaver, 7:30 p.m., Wister Gym.....February 15

C&L Series: Samuel Hazo, poetry reading, Theatre, 12:30 p.m.....February 15

Faculty meeting: day.....February 16

ED S.A.M. Speaker Meeting: 9:30 p.m., CU 301.....February 16

Concert: Philharmonica Orchestra, 8:30 p.m., Ballroom.....February 17

Live Music Program: Sounds of Liberation (Afro-Cuban and Latin  
Music), Theatre, 12:30 p.m.....February 17

Freshman Basketball: vs. University of Penn., Wister Gym,  
7:30 p.m.....February 17

R.O.T.C. Military Ball: 9:00 p.m., Warwick Hotel.....February 18

ED Student Congress: 9:55 p.m., CU 307.....February 21-22

Concert: Betsy Fearn (guitar and folk singer), music room,  
12:30 p.m.....February 22

C&L Series: Gavel Society vs. British Oxford Debating Team,  
12:30 p.m., Theatre.....February 22

Student Government Open Meeting: 2:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m., CU 301.....February 22

# CALENDAR OF EVENTS (continued)

Page Two

Theatre La Salle: "You're A Good Man, Charlie Brown",  
(eve. time tba), matinee Feb. 26 - 2:00 p.m....February 23-27

Basketball: vs. Syracuse, Palestra, 8:45 p.m.....February 23

I.E.E.E. Speaker Meeting, 10:05 p.m., CU 307.....February 24

Basketball: vs. Villanova, Palestra, 8:45 p.m.....February 26

ED S.A.M. Plant Tour.....February 26

Freshman Basketball: vs. St. John's College H.S., Wister Gym,  
3:00 p.m.....February 26

Taped Music Program: An Experiment in Comedy, music room,  
12:30 p.m.....February 28

New Cinema: "Joe", Theatre, 12:30 & 6 p.m.....March 1

Women's Basketball: vs. Penn State (Ogontz), Wister Gym,  
8:30 p.m.....March 1

ED President's Council: 9:55 p.m., CU 301.....March 1

Panel: "Study and Work", Theatre, 12:30 p.m.....March 2

Feature Film: "Getting Straight", 7:00 & 9:30 p.m., Theatre.....March 3-4

ED S.A.M. Community Service Project.....March 3

Basketball: M.A.C. Playoffs, Palestra.....March 3-4

Theatre La Salle: "You're A Good Man, Charlie Brown",  
11:00 a.m. & 2:00 p.m. (special performances)..March 4, 11, 18

Mid-semester grades due: day and evening division.....March 6

Pre-registration: day, juniors.....March 6-10

Women's Basketball: vs. Penn Morton, 7:30 p.m., Wister Gym.....March 7

Concert: Cashman and Raiken (folksingers), Theatre, 12:30 p.m....March 7

Concern Series: "Judaism", 12:30 p.m.....March 7-10

C&L Series: Joan Kerr Dance Company, 12:30 p.m., Theatre.....March 9

Faculty Senate Open Session: 12:30 p.m., CU 301.....March 9

ED S.A.M. Speaker Meeting: 9:30 p.m., CU 307.....March 9

Pre-Registration: evening division.....March 10-30

Last day for withdrawal from classes (day and evening division)..March 10

Calendar of Events (continued)  
Page Three

Feature Films: "At the Circus" (6:30 & 9:45 p.m.), and  
                  "Night at the Opera" (8:15 p.m.), Theatre.....March 10-11

Coffee House: club room, 7:30 p.m. - 12:00 p.m.....March 10-11

Pre-registration: sophomores.....March 13-17

Taped Music Program: The Beatles complete, music room, 12:30 p.m....March 13

C&L Series: Neil Sheehan, "The Pentagon Papers and the  
                  Centralized State", 12:30 p.m., Theatre.....March 14

Ring Day: orders taken in union lobby, 9:00 a.m.-8:30 p.m.....March 14

New Cinema: "Intolerance", Theatre, 12:30 p.m. & 6 p.m.....March 15

C&L Series: John Toland, "Adolph Hitler", Theatre, 12:30 p.m.....March 16

Concert: choir concert, 8:00 p.m., Theatre.....March 17

Pre-registration: freshman.....March 20-24

Taped Music Program: Music of the avant garde, music room,  
                                  12:30 p.m.....March 20

Live Music Program: Swischer Penicillin (avant garde jazz),  
                                  music room, 12:30 p.m.....March 21

ED S.A.M. Speaker Meeting: 9:30 p.m., CU 307.....March 21

I.E.E.E. Speaker Meeting: 10:05 p.m., CU 307.....March 23

Coffee House: club room, 7:30 p.m.-12:00 p.m.....March 24-25

ED Cross Keys: election of officers, 8:00 p.m, CU 301.....March 24

ED S.A.M. Plant Tour.....March 25

Taped Music Program: Festival of Classical Music, music room,  
                                  12:30 p.m.....March 27

Student Government Open Meeting: day, 2:30 - 5:00 p.m, CU 301.....March 28

ED Student Congress: 9:55 p.m., CU 307.....March 28

C&L Series: Dr. Adolph Butkys, "Students as Consumer Advocates",  
                  Olney Hall 100, 12:30 p.m.....March 28

New Cinema: "Citizen Kane", Theatre, 12:30 & 6 p.m.....March 29

Easter vacation: day, 4:30 p.m., evening, 10:15 p.m.....March 30

Residence Halls Close: 6:00 p.m.....March 30

Calendar of Events (continued)

Page Four

Industrial Relations Commission Washington Trip.....April 5  
S.A.M. Seminar: 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m., Theatre.....April 8  
Residence halls reopen at noon.....April 9  
Alumni Spring Reception: Ballroom.....April 9  
Classes resume: day and evening division.....April 10  
ED President's Council: 9:55 p.m., CU 301.....April 10  
Class of 1973 senior portraits: day, Union 3rd fl.....April 10-14  
Taped music program: rock & roll revival, music room,  
12:30 p.m.....April 10  
Concern Series: "Homosexuality", 12:30 p.m.....April 11-14  
Ring day: orders taken in union lobby, 9:00 a.m.-8:30 p.m.....April 12

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

## SPRISSLER APPOINTED NEW TREASURER OF THE COLLEGE

Dr. Joseph J. Sprissler, vice president for business affairs at La Salle College, has been elected treasurer of the Corporation of the college, it was announced by Brother A. Philip Nelan, F.S.C., Ph.D., chairman of the college's Board of Trustees.

Dr. Sprissler's unanimous election followed a change in the by-laws of the Board of Trustees separating the offices of President and Treasurer of the Corporation formerly held by the president.

Sprissler, who has been the financial adviser to the Board of Trustees, was moved a vice president of the college in 1958. A teacher and administrator at the college since 1932 (except for a brief period during World War II), he founded the college's evening division in 1946.

In 1964, Dr. Sprissler was proclaimed an Affiliate of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, becoming the first member of the La Salle staff to receive this honor. Only a dozen laymen have been Affiliated by the Baltimore District of the Christian Brothers in the past century.

Dr. Sprissler and his wife, Miriam, reside in Germantown and have two adult children.

\* \* \* \* \*

FELS FUND TO SUPPORT COLLEGE STUDY WORKSHOPS

The Samuel S. Fels Fund of Philadelphia will support a program to investigate shifting attitudes toward work in modern society and their impact on the career preparation and general educational functions of the urban college, it was announced by Brother Daniel Burke, F.S.C., Ph.D., president of the college.

A grant of \$10,000 has been received to support two workshops for faculty, students, and staff and to develop several communications programs to involve the total campus in the results of the workshop.

Interested parties should contact Bruce V. MacLeod, Ph.D., dean of business administration, who will coordinate the workshops which are slated for this spring and summer. Specific goals for the project were the following:

Work and College: A Proposal to the Fels Foundation (December, 1971)

## The Problem

The role of work in modern society is one of the more confused concepts in a period of much confusion for all institutions. Rapid technological advance has offered the prospect of shortened hours of work for many and expanded leisure. Previous over-emphasis on work, however, and its material benefits has led to over-reaction among younger people that has impaired the attractiveness of professional and other more substantial careers and which leaves unanswered the role of work in personal or community development. Alex Mood has recently described a possible trend:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT (Continued)

A great deal of the work that must be done to provide people essentials such as food, clothing, shelter, communication, transportation, learning, recreation and government is dull. On the other hand, more and more people are obtaining higher education: in order to earn their livelihoods a great many of them will have no choice but to settle for dull jobs which barely use their education and give them little satisfaction. The real meaning of their lives will, therefore, have to be found elsewhere; their true careers will be in activities that may have nothing to do with their jobs--activities that are limited only by their personal aims and ambitions and not by the unavailability of employment in the necessity to get along in some corporate or bureaucratic structure.

The current tightening of the job market has created two challenges for the typical college. On the one hand, the college has to review one of its traditional functions in preparing students for work, whether for job or career. On the other hand, the college has to distinguish again its more basic and primary task of educating whole persons with sharpened intellectual powers and a keener sense of values--no matter what kind of work is finally attempted. In the first instance, the task is complicated by the multiplication of options available to the graduate; by the corresponding development of new service and other careers in a period of technological change; by the large shifts of emphasis created by government programs in defense, aerospace, or urban development. In the second instance, the growing opinion (as in a recent Carnegie Commission report) that a college degree constitutes over-preparation for the majority of new jobs which will develop over the next decade, pressures the college to clarify its more general educational mission--and to do a better selling job for it.

On the general role of work in society and changing attitudes about it, an urban college has special resources for study which it has not always fully utilized. A large majority of its students can probably bring the actual experience of sustained manual and other kinds of labor to the classroom as a datum for systematic reflection. Work has yielded financial support for the student's education; it can perhaps yield important insights for career planning or for general philosophical, theological, economic, psychological or sociological understanding.

The Proposal

To enable La Salle College to discuss in some systematic fashion and to clarify for its faculty and students the general relationship of college and work under modern conditions, the following goals are proposed:

1. to have some twenty-two departments review how their majors develop skills that can be related to specific jobs and careers, such a review eventuating, perhaps, in a re-edition of the College publication, Career and Courses.
2. to develop a mini-course(e.g., four to six lectures and discussions) on current concepts of, and attitudes of work, job, and career--presented on a team-taught basis and made available to all interested students.



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT (Continued)

3. to support existing mini-courses sponsored by the Placement Office on specific careers and on orientation to careers--perhaps by making courses available on tape cassettes.
4. to develop an elective inter-disciplinary course on work and leisure in modern society--to involve, e.g., economics, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and theology departments.
5. to develop several units (that is, materials for one or two weeks of lectures and discussions) on modern concepts of work for possible inclusion in relevant general education courses offered in the present curriculum.
6. to investigate the possibility of work-study, cooperative, and placement programs (as in the present placements for social work major); conceivably the development of a freshman year program that would be designed for high school graduates very uncertain about their plans for whom a split program of work and study would give additional time for career planning.

The major means to be taken toward these goals would be two workshops in the spring semester and the summer of 1972. Some twenty to twenty-five faculty and students would follow lectures and discussion with work in developing resource materials, bibliographies, and outlines. The spring workshop would be only for a weekend, hopefully away from the campus; the summer workshop would be for two weeks. The College's spring "Education Week" in 1972 could also include "work and college" among its major topics so that some continuity during the spring semester would be established.

\*

\*

\*

ASSISTANCE TO PHILIPPINE COLLEGES

Two colleges in the Philippine Islands, De La Salle College of Manila and Notre Dame of Jolo, approached La Salle some time ago suggesting some species of affiliation, according to Brother Daniel Burke, F.S.C., Ph.D., president of the college.

While the main thrust of their proposal was to obtain a mainland base for better approach to and channeling of foundation support in the Asian programs of American foundations (both colleges have good records already), the further thought was that exchanges or other types of cooperative action might follow among the institutions.

At its December meeting, the Board approved the notion in principle and asked for a statement of agreement. Because of the present economic stringencies of our own institution, however, they asked that any budgetary involvements be avoided for the present, and that if any cooperative programs did develop they only be with off-campus support.

Inquiries or suggestions about the arrangement may be directed to the President's Office.

\*\*\*\*\*

VICE PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

An "In the Literature" excerpt has been submitted by Brother Emery C. Mollenhauer, F.S.C., Ph.D., vice president, academic affairs, and is located at the back of this faculty bulletin.

\*\*\*\*\*

VICE PRESIDENT, PUBLIC AFFAIRS

## APRIL FACULTY BULLETIN

The deadline for the final faculty bulletin of this academic year will be Thursday, March 30, with publication scheduled for Wednesday, April 12. A blank faculty bulletin news memo has been enclosed at the rear of this faculty bulletin. Therefore, items for the April bulletin may be submitted at any time prior to March 30 via campus mail or personal delivery to CU 205.

\*\*\*\*\*

ALUMNI

## SOCIAL TO FOLLOW NOTRE-DAME-LA SALLE BASKETBALL CLASH

The college's alumni basketball club will sponsor a post-game social at Cavanaugh's Restaurant (313 Market Street) immediately following the bounceball battle between the Fighting Irish and Explorers Saturday, February 5.

Tickets for the single-game Palestra attraction, slated to begin at 8:00 P.M., and for the social, featuring hors d'oeuvres and cash bar, are \$6.00.

Reservations may be made through Bill Fynes, assistant alumni director (ext. 421).

\* \* \*

## LAS VEGAS NIGHT TO BE HELD FEBRUARY 19

"A Night in Las Vegas" will be the theme of a gala dinner dance sponsored by the college's alumni association Saturday evening, February 19 in the college union ballroom from 9:00 P.M. to 1:00 A.M.

The cost of \$17.50 per couple or \$10.00 for singles covers a buffet dinner, open bar, and dancing to Cleve McBride and his orchestra.

Futher information and reservations can be obtained through Bill Fynes, ext. 421.

\*\*\*\*\*

COUNSELING CENTER

## GROWTH GROUPS FORMING

The Counseling Center is in the process of forming growth groups for the Spring semester. Faculty who wish to refer students for this experience should contact any member of the Counseling Center staff, ext. 231.

\*\*\*\*\*

THEATRE LA SALLE

## "YOU'RE A GOOD MAN CHARLIE BROWN" TO OPEN FEBRUARY 23

Theatre La Salle, in association with the Masque, will present "You're A Good Man Charlie Brown" on the evenings of February 23 through 27 (Times: TBA), it was announced by Daniel J. Rodden, managing director and professor of English.

On three following Saturdays, March 4, 11 and 18, performances will be given at both 11:00 A.M. and 2:00 P.M.

In addition, a free matinee for faculty children 12 and under, will be held Saturday, February 26 at 2:00 P.M.

"This is either a children's play for adults or an adults play for children and nobody has been able to decide which," notes Rodden. "Anyway it's been charming audiences all over the country for the past five years."

The presentation with Rodden directing, Robert Bush as musical director, and Robert Wilson as choreographer is the first offering of "You're A Good Man Charlie Brown" by a Philadelphia area college.

Featuring a cast of La Salle students, the show will have Gary Brubach appearing as Charlie Brown, and Kate McCauley as Lucy. Michael Dell'Orto will play Schroeder, Robert Baker will be Linus, Bernadette Galanti will play Patty, and Marcus Brown will be Snoopy.

Tickets for the February evening shows are \$3.00, while all seats for the March Saturday performances are \$2.00; all La Salle student tickets are \$1.50 for the entire run.

Faculty members will receive a letter regarding complimentary tickets for the opening and are urged to pass information regarding the show to schools attended by their children. Special group and school rates will be available (VI-3-3192) with Masque president Dennis Robinson handling theatre party arrangements.

\*\*\*\*\*



URBAN STUDIES CENTER

## FULL SLATE OF SPRING TERM ACTIVITIES SET BY URBAN CENTER

Presentations of the Urban Center this semester will begin with the McCarty Institute, an organization of college students providing a learning experience for themselves in the areas of self-awareness and social change. The Institute, which has been given substantial assistance by the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania, will be at 12:30 P.M. Tuesday, February 8 in the College Union.

Future plans include presentations on community ideas and programs regarding education, an evening with the Creativity Council of the Congress of African People, and a presentation on projected models for alternative social institutions.

A series of seminars on the Northwest Philadelphia community will be delivered beginning Tuesday, February 15, at the Center, and are open to all interested faculty and students.

Also on the semester agenda are a Tenant Organizing Conference (postponed from last semester), continued cooperation with the Relate, Inc. Program, and occasional public forums on current urban community development issues.

The Urban Center invites all faculty members to visit its new facilities at 5501 Wister Street, and a formal open house will be held later in the semester.

Faculty suggestions are welcomed, and the Center is anxious to be of assistance to any faculty member, particularly in the relationship of his/her academic concerns to current community ideas, organizations and activities.

\*\*\*\*\*

PUBLISHED, SPOKE, MET, ETC.

- BANGS, Brother Arthur J., F.S.C., Ph.D., assistant professor, education, had article "Privileged Communication and the Counseling Profession" published in the December issue of The Personnel and Guidance Journal.
- BROOKS, Dr. Victor D., associate professor, psychology, lectured on "The Influence of Status on Personnel" at the Industrial and Labor Relations seminar at Cornell University October 8. He delivered a speech on "Vocational Self-Sabotage" to a seminar on the hard core unemployed at Princeton October 22. On November 19, Dr. Brooks spoke on "Current Occupational Trends" at a seminar of the United States Civil Service Commission in Washington. He also repeated his lecture on "Vocational Self-Sabotage" at a United States Department of Labor seminar December 16.
- CLEARY, Dr. C. Richard, professor, political science, has been commissioned by Medford (New Jersey) Historical Society to write a segment of the volume History of Medford to be published in September, 1972.
- DIXON, Dr. Christa K., assistant professor, German, attended the National Convention of the American Association of Teachers of German in Chicago. Dr. Dixon has had an article "Peter Handke Die Angst Des Tormann beim Elfmeter. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation." in Sprachkunst, University of Vienna. Also, the first performance of "Four Songs" by Christa Dixon, music by Reinhold Weber, in Karlsruhe, Germany.
- ELLIS, Brother F. Patrick, F.S.C., Ph.D., associate professor, English, director of development, addressed the spring term faculty meeting at Georgian Court College on "Innovation in Undergraduate Education" January 24.
- FARNON, William J., assistant professor, philosophy, composed a Christmas carol entitled "Christmas Prayer for Peace". An arrangement for cello, organ and children's chorus was performed at Midnight Mass, and an arrangement for soprano and organ was performed on Christmas morning at Our Mother of Sorrows church, Philadelphia.
- HARBISON, John L., instructor, evening division, history, had article "No Longer Invisible in Pensauken" published in January's issue of the New Jersey Education Association Review.
- REIFSTECK, L. Thomas, associate professor, marketing, director of career planning and placement, recently attended the meeting of the College in Tucson, Arizona. Mr. Reifsteck is a past president of the CPC, as well as chairman of the nominating committee, finance committee, and parliamentarian. The Council is a non-profit organization devoted to the exchange of information on college-trained manpower in the United States and Canada.
- SCHREINER, Dr. Frank J., associate professor, psychology, director of the counseling center, was named chairman of the Ad Hoc Sex Committee; he is also serving as an advisor to the Archdiocesan Youth Conference.
- WALLACE, Brother Anthony, F.S.C., Ed.D., assistant professor, education, conducted professional seminars on "Educational Change and Innovation" with the principals of the Philadelphia Archdiocesan Secondary Schools at Elkins Park December 1, with the staff of Bishop Neumann high school December 3, and with the Philadelphia Archdiocesan Secondary School Directors of Studies December 9 at Elkins Park. Brother addressed the Home-School societies

PUBLISHED, SPOKE, MET, ETC. (Cont'd.)

of Chester County on "Educational Innovations" December 14.

In addition, he conducted professional seminars on "Educational Change and Innovation" with the staff of Northeast Catholic high January 10 the staff of Hallahan Catholic high January 11, the staff of Bishop McDevitt high (Wyncote, Pa.) January 12, and with the staff of Bishop Conwell high (Fairless Hills, Pa.) January 13.

Brother Anthony was honored as the first recipient of the Principal's Medal by La Salle College high school at their endowment fund banquet at the Holiday Inn, Penn Center, Pa., January 26.

Also, Brother will be presented the award for "Distinguished Service to Secondary Education in the United States" by the National Association of Secondary School Principals at their annual convention in Anaheim, California, March 17.



IN THE LITERATURE

"The Teaching Environment" - Jerry Gaff and Robert Wilson (Jerry Gaff is Associate Research Psychologist and Robert C. Wilson is Research Psychologist at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley.)

The Project to Improve College Teaching was established in September, 1969, as a two-year joint program of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. A grant from the Carnegie Corporation provided financial support, and an advisory board from the two associations gave overall direction to its activities. These included five national conferences, the director's visits to seventy campuses, and a number of publications. The first of these, *The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching*, appeared in November, 1970. A similar booklet, *Career Development of the Effective College Teacher*, appeared in November of this year. Both grew out of conferences on these subjects involving students, faculty, and administrators from a wide range of colleges and universities. The project's final report will be published by Jossey-Bass, Inc., early next year. All publications are available through the AAUP's Washington Office.

The following study was commissioned by the project through the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. The study, in an expanded form, was used as a background paper for the project's final conference held at St. John's College in Santa Fe, June 16-19, 1971. Though formal adoption of the recommendations and proposals in this study were not sought, the conference group was in substantial agreement both with the findings as presented here and with the conclusions and proposals.

Environmental quality has become a prime concern of many academics in recent years. While their attention has been riveted upon developments beyond the campus, much criticism has been directed at colleges and universities as environments for teaching and learning. Some critics assert that traditional higher education should be modified, others that alternative educational enterprises should be devised, and still others that society should be entirely deschooled. While this debate continues, free universities and experimental colleges are springing up all across the country to provide alternative educational contexts. In this climate faculty members would be well advised to study and improve the quality of the environment for which they have primary responsibility, that which supports the teaching mission of their own institutions.

Each of the 2,537 colleges and universities in the United States has particular programs, policies, procedures, and personnel with which it attempts to influence the kinds of teaching, learning, and living which occur within its context. The totality of these factors constitute the environment of a school which both affords opportunities and sets limitations on individuals. Few people are able to rise above their environment and consistently act against its constraints.

Perhaps even more important than the actual characteristics of a college are the ways individuals conceive of their surroundings. For all practical purposes the environment as perceived is the real environment because people act on the basis of their perceptions. Thus, if a faculty member believes his colleagues are not interested in teaching, that is an important fact for him even if they are actually very much interested. Teachers, students, and administrators are all "hemmed in" by their views of their environments.

Because of their importance in shaping the lives of individuals, college environments have been studied extensively. Stimulated by P.E. Jacob's provocative question, "What happens to the values held by American college students as a result of the[ir] general education?", most of this work has examined environments from the students' point of view. The overriding purposes of this research tradition have been to determine how students perceive the overall social-psychological climate of their schools and to assess how students learn and grow in different kinds of environments.

Just as college environments have been studied from the point of view of students, so can they be examined from the point of view of teachers. An exploratory study of forty-six faculty members in four quite different schools was undertaken to learn what factors faculty regarded as important about their environments. The faculty respondents who were interviewed mentioned three aspects of their environments as having significant impact on teaching: (1) institutional policies and practices concerning teachers, (2) the nature of the student body, and (3) the character of faculty colleagues. An extensive but not exhaustive review of the research literature on each of these topics was then conducted.

The aim of this paper is to present a research-based analysis of college environments from the perspective of college teachers, specifically to examine the ways that the social-psychological environment is affected by college policies and practices concerning teachers and teaching, the characteristics of students and faculty-student relationships, and the characteristics of faculty colleagues and colleague relationships.

### Policies and Practices Concerning Teachers

The single most important factor in the success or failure of any attempt to improve college teaching is the motivation of the faculty. Faculty motivation can be either a powerful catalyst or a major source of resistance for any change in educational goals or practices. Motivation is seldom generated or sustained by statements of purposes in college catalogs, press releases, inspirational addresses delivered during precollege faculty meetings, or similar manifestations of good intentions. Rather it is the product of specific institutional policies and practices.

#### Reward Structure

Perhaps the most important policy affecting the motivations of faculty members is the reward structure of their institution. If faculty members are to give undergraduate teaching a high priority in their scale of values, if they are to devote a considerable portion of their time to teaching and students, and if they are to derive satisfactions which sustain them, there must be a visible structure of rewards for such efforts.

The reward structure in its broadest sense includes both the distribution of extrinsic rewards and provisions for faculty to derive intrinsic satisfactions from their work. Extrinsic rewards are typically the granting of salary increases, promotions, and tenure. Intrinsic rewards include a sense of commitment to shared goals of recognized high purpose, feelings of personal and professional growth, and concomitant feelings of accomplishment, satisfaction, and self-esteem.

Although they may be separated conceptually, these different sources of motivation are frequently mutually reinforcing. For example, the extrinsic reward of a promotion or a salary increase often produces intrinsic satisfaction: it may contribute to a teacher's self-esteem because it implies that colleagues and/or students believe that one is doing a good job.

There is widespread dissatisfaction among faculty members with the present criteria upon which salary and promotion decisions are based. A survey by the authors found that teaching was a major source of satisfaction in the lives of 88 per cent of the faculty and that 92 per cent felt that "effectiveness as a teacher" should be either "quite" or "very important" in salary and promotion decisions. However, only 39 per cent thought that teaching effectiveness actually was "quite" or "very important" at their own institutions. This discrepancy was found in every one of the six very diverse schools surveyed. It seems that while most faculty individually value good teaching, they do not believe that good teaching leads to advancement in their institutions.

Critics of the reward structure of higher education repeatedly have pointed to the paradox that while faculty are hired to teach, they are rewarded not for their teaching abilities or efforts, but for their research or scholarly prowess. While this assertion has been documented at several universities, it is important to note that in junior colleges, where research is not emphasized, other factors work against teaching. Faculty in these kinds of schools frequently believe that their advancement depends more upon seniority, school service, or community service than upon the quality of their teaching. Thus, the problem of adequately rewarding effective teaching is pervasive in higher education, and not limited to research-oriented universities.

H.A. Wallin has shown that the reward structure does make a difference in what faculty members do. He studied the activity patterns of faculties at two community colleges; one had provisions for merit salary increases while the other gave salary increases for years of service within various personnel classifications. He found that the faculty members in the college which gave merit salary increases for teaching effectiveness actually engaged in more teaching-related activities such as counseling students, reading in their subjects, and attending conferences and seminars in their fields. It appeared that these differential activity patterns were the result of the recognition and rewarding of teaching.

Although the problem of rewarding teaching is universal, it is probably the relationship between teaching and research, especially in major universities and some four-year colleges, that has received the most attention. It should be kept in mind, however, that the majority of all college teaching is done in schools where pressure to publish is minimal, and by faculty members who neither conduct research nor publish.



There are two working assumptions regarding the relationship between teaching and research. The first holds that the two activities are essentially antithetical. The time expended to become a productive scholar and do research is taken away from teaching activities, such as classroom preparation, close contact with students, and intellectual supervision of them. The second view is that the two activities are mutually reinforcing. The best teacher is a scholar who keeps abreast of the content and methods of a field through continuing involvement in research and who communicates knowledge and enthusiasm for a subject to students. While there are elaborations and variations on both assumptions, these seem to be basic issues underlying the teaching-research debate.

The majority of faculty members in the Gaff-Wilson study felt that both teaching effectiveness and scholarly productivity should form a substantial part of any evaluation procedure for promotion. Those who feel that teaching should be a more important criterion in the reward structure do not necessarily feel that therefore research should be unimportant. For most faculty the discrepancy between how important research and scholarly activity is and how important it should be was nearly as great as for that of teaching effectiveness. Dissatisfaction with the underemphasis on research was greatest at the four-year colleges and universities which lack an explicit research mission. This dissatisfaction is understandable when faculty views of the relationship between teaching and research are considered. The majority thought that "involvement in research makes for more exciting teaching" and "teachers involved in research are more likely to keep up to date in their fields." Most of the community college faculty, on the other hand, thought that "research cuts into teaching preparation time and time to work with students." Thus, for most faculty at four-year colleges and universities teaching and research are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they believe that research improves the quality of teaching.

While the past decades have given rise to much rhetoric and vociferous debate over the contributions of an individual's research or scholarly pursuits to his or her teaching effectiveness, the available research evidence suggests that there probably is little relationship between the two. Three collaborators have reported the results from three separate studies using three different methods which indicate that "knowledge of a professor's teaching quality or of the quality of his research does not help in knowing the other." In a review of the literature one writer has concluded, "To the extent that ratings of teachers' instruction are a fair criterion, students seldom suffer appreciably if their instructor is a researcher and writer, and in some cases have shown signs of real benefit." While all the evidence is not yet in, neither of the two common assumptions concerning the relationship of teaching and research are supported by existing studies. That is, it seems that research activity is not a necessary condition for a person to become effective as a teacher, and it appears that research activity does not necessarily make a person ineffective as a teacher.

Despite these findings, being interested in both teaching and research poses a serious problem for most faculty members. In a massive survey of faculty in the spring of 1969 conducted by Martin Trow and Seymour M. Lipset, 54 per cent of the faculty said their interests were in both teaching and research, 42 per cent said they were "heavily involved in teaching" and only 4 per cent were interested in research to the virtual exclusion of teaching. There was more interest in research and hence more conflict between the two as one moved from junior colleges, through four-year colleges, to universities. Parsons and Platt found that 59 per cent of the faculty in eight institutions

said they experienced a sense of conflict between teaching and research. These competing demands do create a problem for the faculty member's allocation of time and energy, especially at the college and university level. It would appear that the reward structure can play a critical role in the way he assigns priorities to these activities.

The teaching-research problem is especially serious because there are in fact two reward structures tugging and pulling at a faculty member. One's national advancement rests on publishing in a specialty, being active in a professional society, and being visible and respected by specialists at other schools. One's advancement locally, although related to one's professional activity, may operate quite independently of the national system. It depends on one's contributions to the school by teaching, counseling, administration, and, if the school values national prominence, one's national professional standing. It can well be argued that to the extent that faculty in recent years have become more concerned with their national prominence and less interested in local teaching activities, it is because these two advancement procedures have gotten out of balance. That is, faculty have tried to advance nationally at least in part because they do not perceive they can get ahead by virtue of their teaching at home. It would seem that a strengthening of the institutional advancement procedure, especially at the university level, by rewarding teaching effectiveness would not only be welcomed by most faculty but would also help counteract the powerful pull of the national reward structure. At the same time, more emphasis on research and scholarly activity at four-year colleges, and perhaps even at junior colleges, would probably enhance the quality of teaching.

Several proposals have been advanced to increase the importance of teaching in the advancement procedure, usually to resolve the teaching-research problem. Perhaps most common is to separate the teaching and research activities of faculty members. One type of separation is largely spatial or administrative and involves housing research in institutes and centers around the periphery of universities while departments have responsibility for teaching. Another form is to have faculty teach and conduct research sequentially so that they can give each activity the attention it deserves without interference from the other. The main difficulty with each of these procedures is that they can accommodate only a fraction of the faculty; the rest have to live with the conflict.

Another approach has been attempted by universities which have developed on the cluster college plan. For example, at the University of California at Santa Cruz and at San Diego, faculty members have an appointment in a college as well as in an academic department. A person is advanced in this system on the basis of his or her contributions to both the college and the discipline. The plan is to build in deliberately a tension between teaching and research activities, to place each activity under separate administrative jurisdictions, and to give both the college provost and department chairman responsibility for recommending a person's promotion.

Another more modest approach is to attempt to make the current system work better by giving more emphasis to teaching. For example, Charles Hitch, President of the University of California, has recently informed members of that system that all recommendations for promotion must include more than the usually positive statements from the department chairman concerning the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. Recommendations must include evidence, including that from students, about the quality of teaching.

An attempt to resolve the teaching-research problem in a very different way is to divorce the training of college teachers from the training of researchers. One such approach is the establishment of Doctor of Arts degrees in ten institutions in 1971 with the support of the Carnegie Corporation. The Doctor of Arts program is designed especially to prepare college teachers, omits the research-thesis requirement, and often provides supervised teaching experience; it would supplant the Ph.D., as a teaching degree, and leave the Ph.D. as the primary research doctorate. Yale's Master of Philosophy degree and comparable degrees awarded in some midwestern universities are similar in intent.

### Teaching Evaluation

If the reward structure is to place more emphasis on teaching effectiveness and if, as seems likely, faculty performance is to come under more searching review, the need to evaluate teaching reliably becomes crucial. The subject of teacher evaluations has a long and sometimes controversial history, and both the research and the speculative literature on evaluations are extensive. It has been pointed out often that evaluation goes on from the time that the teacher first takes a job, whether or not the faculty or administration authorized such evaluation and whether or not it is formalized. Thus it is not a question of whether teaching should be evaluated, but what purposes evaluation is to serve, whether the evaluation should be formalized, who should be involved in the evaluation process, and what criteria and instruments of measurement should be used.

Typically, evaluation serves two different purposes. First, it may provide teachers with feedback about their behavior. Such feedback is different in kind from that which teachers ordinarily gain from class discussion and from student performance on tests, papers, and the like. While sensitive teachers may be very much aware of the way their students respond, specific reactions of students and perhaps of colleagues can help teachers learn to improve their techniques. Second, reliable information about teaching can be used to improve the quality of decisions concerning faculty advancement. If teaching criteria are to be more important in these personnel decisions, then there must be systematic assessment of teaching.

By and large, as can be seen in the two surveys of Wilson and Gaff, faculty support teaching evaluation. In the 1968 survey, 72 per cent of the faculty said they favored a formal procedure to evaluate teaching. Eighty-two per cent of those in favor felt that students should be involved in the evaluation, 76 per cent felt that colleagues should be similarly involved, and 73 per cent felt that departmental chairmen should be involved; only a third or less felt that deans or alumni should also participate in such evaluations. In their 1970 survey, 85 per cent of the respondents endorsed the idea that a formal program of teacher evaluations of faculty should be "used by the college in making decisions about such matters as salary, promotion, and tenure," by far a more threatening use than simply providing feedback to individual teachers. Trow and Lipset found that three out of every five faculty members agreed with the statement, "Faculty promotions should be based in part on formal student evaluations of their teachers," and there was virtually no difference between those in two-year colleges, four-year colleges, or universities.

Procedures which have been used to obtain systematic evidence about teaching include classroom visitation, self-assessment, examination of course materials, and student ratings. By far the most prevalent is the last.



Student evaluations are typically conducted by means of objective questionnaires. Although the issue of student evaluation of teaching is timely, it has a long history. The Purdue Rating Scale has been in use for forty years and the University of Washington has conducted such evaluations since the 1920's. During this time much has been learned about student ratings. For example, much research supports the following generalizations:

1. There is general agreement among students and between students and faculty on the effectiveness of teachers.
2. The judgments which students make about their teachers persist and are replicated years after they graduate.
3. Student ratings are relatively independent of student characteristics which are commonly thought of as sources of bias, such as grade point average, actual grade and expected grade in the course, and class level.
4. Student ratings are positively correlated with the amount of student learning.
5. Several objective instruments have been developed which are reliable, valid, easily available, and practical to administer. These include, in addition to the time-tested ones mentioned earlier, two recently developed instruments, Student Description of Teaching developed by Hildebrand and Wilson, and Student Opinion of Teaching and Course, developed by W.J. McKeachie.

These issues and others have been discussed more thoroughly by Kenneth Eble, who has drawn this conclusion:

It seems clear that student evaluations, wisely-formulated, wisely-administered, and wisely-used, are useful in improving teaching. It is equally clear that good evaluations require time, money, and the cooperation of students, faculty, and administration. It is also clear that evaluations are not the sole means of judging teaching and that teaching is not the sole measure of a faculty member's competence.

#### Work Load

Much attention has been given to the subject of faculty work loads over the years, and numerous surveys of work loads have been undertaken to attempt to determine norms and to set standards. A chief concern of the college teaching profession has been to decrease the number of hours spent in classroom teaching activities and to establish equity in the diverse demands on faculty members' energies and time. It is apparent from recent surveys that the average class load now generally ranges from six to fifteen hours nationwide and that it has been steadily declining to present levels over the past years. Of course, there are important differences among community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities, the first two having an appropriately higher teaching load than the latter.

Teaching is often thought of simply as what a professor does within the classroom. This conception leads many people not familiar with academic life to a distorted view of the college professor's work week. But anyone familiar with academic life realizes that classroom teaching is just the most visible activity, that it rests upon much less visible activity, and that much teaching occurs outside the classroom. Numerous work-load studies document that even though their classroom teaching load has been reduced, college teachers

actually work on the average between fifty and sixty hours per week.

Exactly how professors spend all of their work time is not known. There seem to have been no thorough job-analysis studies of college teachers. However, the following teaching-related activities are engaged in by many college teachers:

1. Classroom teaching activities -- lecturing, leading discussions, suggesting reading references, making assignments.

2. Preparatory classroom activities -- reading assigned books, preparing notes, constructing reading lists, devising assignments, preparing laboratory demonstrations, securing equipment for studio classes.

3. Associated housekeeping activities -- taking roll, making problem sets, preparing quizzes and examinations, reading and grading quizzes and examinations, reading term papers, evaluating class projects.

4. Course-planning activities -- reconsidering the needs and interests of students, the state of the field and its relation to society, reviewing possible textbooks, planning course sequences.

5. Out-of-class teaching activities -- talking with students about classroom discussions, clarifying assignments, helping students plan and prepare term papers or projects, holding paper or examination conferences, discussing intellectual matters with students, helping students learn how to study, supervising independent study.

6. Advising and counseling activities -- discussing students' vocational aims and plans, advising about academic programs, discussing students' problems, gathering relevant information from other faculty or administrators, acting to help students with difficulties, writing letters of recommendation.

7. Student extracurricular activities -- advising student organizations, chaperoning dances, attending student social functions, discussing campus issues with student groups.

8. Activities concerned with keeping up to date in one's field -- reading books and professional journals in one's specialty, reading in related fields, reading about general cultural developments, attending professional meetings, corresponding with colleagues elsewhere, writing for books, articles, and papers, ordering books for the library.

9. Activities to become informed about campus issues -- talking with colleagues both in and outside of one's department, discussing issues with members of various committees, talking with administrators, reading school newspapers, reading memos, position papers, or planning documents.

10. Departmental governance activities -- attending departmental meetings, serving on department committees, writing memos, proposals, or position papers.

11. Division, college or university governance activities -- same as above.

12. Graduate education activities -- selecting students from applicants, recommending financial assistance for students, preparing, administering and

evaluating graduate examinations, serving on thesis committees, securing jobs for graduates.

13. Research and scholarly activities -- writing proposals, administering funds, supervising assistants, conducting research, preparing reports, writing papers, speaking to colleagues, consulting with other schools, government, or business.

This is not an exhaustive list of activities in which college teachers are engaged, and not all faculty perform all of these activities. However, every single activity listed above is either directly or indirectly concerned with teaching. Clearly teaching involves a complex of activities, only a few of which occur within the familiar confines of the classroom.

If the issue of classroom contact hours has been resolved on generally favorable terms, the problem of establishing equity among faculty members has been more troublesome. A large part of the problem may be that the conceptualizations of professors' activities according to the model of "work load," "credit hours," and "contact hours" are of little use in evaluating the current strains experienced by professors in today's institutions of higher learning. Indeed, they may contribute to the strain, because they do not help one understand and regulate one's flow of energy according to the demands actually placed upon one as a teacher.

An examination of the means used to evaluate faculty work load shows that the kinds of assumptions made about students, which students find untenable, are also made about faculty. That is, the "standard" teacher is as much a creation of bureaucratic efficiency as the "standard" student. It is assumed all faculty members will perform optimally with equivalent class loads and student contact hours. It would seem that institutional policies which permit faculty members to pursue those teaching activities in which they excel at the pace and style in which they are most productive could do much to improve the faculty's sense of competence.

The 1970 AAUP Statement on Faculty Workload identified many common sources of inequity in the distribution of work loads, such as the number of different course preparations, introduction of a new course, size of classes, and responsibilities in research and administration. This is a step forward; however, such attempts to define the problem still do not take into consideration differences in talent, energy, and teaching styles among individual teachers. Furthermore, a class load that is seen as too heavy by one faculty member may not be too heavy for another. Neither do such formulations take into consideration the wide range of teaching activities required of faculty members. Perhaps equity not only in class load, but in evaluations, promotion, and recognition as well, can best be achieved by approaching the case of each individual faculty member in terms of his unique talents, abilities, accomplishments, and preferences.

Individualized contracts may be one useful approach. Rather than an institution's giving a standard contract to all faculty members, individualized contracts would be negotiated which would specify proportion of time each professor would spend in various activities depending on what the institution needs to operate its program and what the professor needs at his or her stage of personal and professional development. For example, one person might contract to spend half of his time teaching an introductory course and half time advising students; another might have an idea for an exciting research project and contract to spend three fourths of her time on that project and one fourth

of her time teaching an advanced course on that topic; another might have been appointed chairman of a major committee and contract to devote half of her time to committee work and half to teaching. Individualized contracts could be devised in such a way as to assure that individual faculty member's needs as well as institutional needs are met.

Individualized contracts not only allow faculty to work on tasks in which they excel but also provide an explicit basis for an individualized evaluation. They can assure faculty that they will be evaluated on what they have explicitly agreed to do, a procedure which can correct the situation in some universities where faculty are hired to teach but evaluated in terms of their research. The explicit weights assigned to the criteria against which each faculty member is to be evaluated should make it clear to each teacher that his teaching counts and how much it counts toward advancement.

The difficulty with individualized contracts is chiefly in reconciling individual strengths and desires with institutional needs. The movement toward open admissions, for example, may make it difficult under a contract or any other system to find large numbers of teachers for relatively low-level or general courses. A workable contract system may require changes in faculty attitudes toward the value of their various professional responsibilities.

In summary, college and university policies and practices concerning the reward structure, tenure, teaching evaluation, and work load do affect the motivation of teachers. Explicit attention to these policies, coupled with reforms where needed, would enhance the teaching environment, motivate faculty to give undergraduate teaching a high priority, and reward teachers for their efforts.